

REMARKS

The Examiner in his paragraph 1 of the Detailed Office Action, objected to the drawings in that several labels in FIG. 1 did not match their reference in the specification. The specification has been amended above to obviate the Examiner's objections to FIG. 1.

The Examiner in his paragraph 2 objected to the drawing in that FIG. 1 included reference signs that were not mentioned in the description. The amendment made on pages 19-20 of the specification makes clear that the items referenced there are in FIG. 1 and should obviate this objection.

The Examiner in his paragraph 3 objected to the drawings in that several labels in FIG. 2 did not match their reference in the specification. The specification has been amended above to obviate the Examiner's objections to FIG. 2.

The Examiner in his paragraph 4 objected to the drawings in that a label in FIG. 6 did not match its reference in the specification. The specification has been amended to obviate the Examiner's objections to FIG. 6.

For the above reasons, the drawings as filed appear to no longer be objectionable.

The Examiner in his paragraphs 5 and 6 objected to the Abstract for its length. The Abstract has been amended above to be less than 150 words.

The Examiner in his paragraph 7a) objected to the disclosure for failing to show certain referenced elements on page 20 in FIG. 3. The specification has

been amended on pages 19-20 making clear that the referenced elements are shown in FIG. 1, and not in FIG. 3.

The Examiner in his paragraph 7b) objected to the omitted serial number of the co-pending application. The specification has been amended above to include that information.

The specification has also been amended to include the corrected title and patent number of the referenced co-pending patent relating to Smart Patents.

The Examiner in his paragraph 9 provisionally rejected claims 1-5, 10-14, 19-23, 28-32, 37-41, 46-50, 55-59, 64-68, and 73-77 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type of double patenting over claims 1-5, 10-14, 19-23, 28-32, 37-41, 43-47, 52-56, 61-654, and 67-71 of co-pending Patent Application Serial No. 09/650,144. Enclosed is a Terminal Disclaimer that disclaims the terminal part of any U.S. patent to be granted on the current application that extends beyond the expiration date of any patent that issues from that commonly owned Patent Application.

The Examiner in his paragraph 11 rejected claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-12, 14-15, 19-21, 23-24, 28-30, 32-33, 37-39, 41-41, 46-48, 50-51, 55-57, 59-60, 64-66, 68-69, 73-75, and 77-78 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the cited Bauer et al. (Bauer) reference. The other claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Bauer and other various cited references.

In the amendments made above, independent claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 37, 46, 55, 64, and 73 have been amended to include the limitations of dependent claims 8, 17, 26, 35, 44, 53, 62, 71, and 80, respectively, each of latter now being

cancelled. In the Examiner's paragraph 15, these dependent claims were rejected as being unpatentable over Bauer and the cited Mizutani reference. The Examiner states that Bauer "does not explicitly teach where the extraction expression generated for one or more of the web clippings includes redundancy to insure that when the web view is replayed to one or more information elements extracted from the retrieved one web page associated with the one web clipping are the actual user-selected information elements". He indicates that Mizutani "sends redundant data and errors are detected and corrected" and that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Mizutani to use redundancy in sending data to check for errors in the system of Bauer..."

The applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's objections. Firstly, the error correcting for a BCH code taught by Mizutani has nothing at all to do with including redundancy in an extraction expression for a web clipping "to insure that when the Web view is replayed, the one or more information elements extracted from the retrieved Web page that is associated with the at least one Web clipping are the actual user-selected information elements." Rather, the redundancy data being sent with the coded data as noted in Mizutani is additional data that is transmitted with coded data for correcting errors that occur in the transmission of the data from a transmitter to a receiver, addressing the problem of correcting for errors in received data due to transmission impairments. The issue addressed in applicants claimed invention is not that the information extracted from a retrieved Web page may be incorrectly transmitted.

Rather the issue addressed is whether the extracted information from the Web page is in fact the information that the user had selected for inclusion on the Web view. There is no issue of whether the information has been transmitted properly but rather whether due to updates and modifications in Web pages the extracted information is that which the user really had selected to be included in the Web view. Thus, the redundancy in applicants' claimed invention is totally unrelated to the error correcting or detecting as is known in the art and as noted in Mizutani, which purposes is only to correct for errors due to transmission impairments. Further, as the Examiner notes, Bauer does not at all disclose or suggest the use of anything at all "to insure that when the Web view is replayed, the one or more information elements extracted from the retrieved Web page that is associated with the at least one Web clipping are the actual user-selected information elements." Again, the Examiner's comment that "it is important that data transmitted through a network is free of errors so that the data received is the correct information" is not what is applicants are doing as per the language in each of the amended independent claims. Applicants are not concerned that the extracted information may be corrupted in transmission but only in whether the extracted information is what in fact is the information that has been selected to be included. The amended independent claims and the dependent claims thereon are thus not obvious over any combination of the cited prior art.

New dependent claims 82-90 are presented herewith. These newly added claims are dependent on what are believed to be allowable independent claims, are fully supported by the specification, and therefore should also be allowable.

For the reasons discussed above, each of the claims presently in the application is believed to be in a condition for allowance. Passage to issue of the subject application is therefore respectfully requested. Should the Examiner feel that the present application is not yet in a condition for allowance and that a telephone or personal interview would be helpful, he is invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney at 973, 386 8252.

Respectfully submitted,

**Vinod Anupam
Yuri J. Breitbart
Juliana Freire Silva
Bharat Kumar**

By 
Stephen M. Gurey
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No.: 27336

Date: March 29, 2004

**Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Room 3J-219
Holmdel, New Jersey 07733-3030**